



Docket No. 17020

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
VERIFICATION OF A TRANSLATION

I, Susan ANTHONY BA, ACIS,
Director of RWS Group Ltd, of Europa House, Marsham Way, Gerrards Cross,
Buckinghamshire, England hereby declare that:

My name and post office address are as stated below;

That the translator responsible for the attached translation is knowledgeable in the English language and in the Japanese language, and that, to the best of RWS Group Ltd knowledge and belief, the English translation of the marked portion of the attached Japanese document is true and complete.

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

Date: September 30, 2005

Signature :

A handwritten signature consisting of two stylized loops and a long horizontal line.

For and on behalf of RWS Group Ltd

Post Office Address :

Europa House, Marsham Way,
Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire,
England.

2. The technological design for which claim 1 seeks protection lacks the inventive step stipulated in Patent Law 22 (3). Cited document 1 discloses a mobile terminal device, and specifically it discloses "a control part which connects to the second network when there is incoming data from the first network" as the characterizing technology (see lines 25-41, second column in the specification of this cited document). The first network and second network of cited document 1 correspond to the local wireless communication means and local wireless communication device of claim 1, respectively. A comparison of the technological design for which this claim seeks protection and the technological content disclosed in this cited document reveals the only difference to be the absence of a memory for recording in cited document 1. However, this difference is a matter of common knowledge. A person skilled in the art could easily devise the technological design for which this claim seeks protection by combining this cited document with the abovementioned common knowledge. Accordingly, since the technological design for which this claim seeks protection offers neither substantial outstanding characteristics nor marked progress, it is lacking in inventive step.